



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 December 2024 by R Pankhurst

Decision by L McKay MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W1905/D/24/3352955

25 Roundmoor Drive, Cheshunt, Hertfordshire EN8 9HZ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr I Elitok against the decision of Broxbourne Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 07/24/0446/HF.
 - The development proposed is an application for two dormer windows to the front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. Roundmoor Drive is a residential street consisting of mainly semi-detached properties and some terrace properties. There is some variation in the style of properties with a few side extensions and front porches, however, the roofscape has remained largely intact. The unbroken front roof planes, pierced only by the regular intermission of brick chimney stacks and occasional rooflights, creates a regular rhythm and distinctive character. The appeal site comprises a two-storey semi-detached property typical of the area, situated in a prominent position on a corner and benefits from an open paved frontage with a low brick wall.
5. The proposed development involves two front dormers with windows. While the proposed windows would be of a similar style to those used in the existing property and of relatively modest proportions, the projection of dormer windows from the front roof slope would be uncharacteristic for the local area and highly noticeable in this location. This would disrupt the distinctive balance and rhythm of the surrounding pattern of development and the symmetry that currently exists with the attached neighbour. Consequently, the proposed front dormers would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
6. While I am aware that changes are being made to the roof form to accommodate the extension to the rear roof, this will have limited impact from the street and on

the relationship with the attached neighbour. Therefore, those works would not have a materially detrimental impact on the largely uniform roofscape of Roundmoor Drive. I acknowledge that there are a few rooflights present nearby, but these do not break the roof plane and are generally of a discreet nature. These factors do not therefore justify the harm that would result from the proposed dormers.

7. The appellant contends that if the proposal is allowed it would allow front dormer development in the local area. However, local and national policies require high quality design that respects local character even outside of designated areas, which for the reasons set out above, this proposal does not achieve. The potential for other developments to come forward in the future does not therefore justify the harm that would result from the proposal before me, which I have considered on its own merits.
8. Therefore, the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, it would conflict with Policies DSC1 and DSC2 of the Broxbourne Local Plan (adopted 2020) which require development proposals to take into account existing patterns of development and not to unduly impact on the wider setting.
9. Furthermore, there would also be conflict with guidance in the Broxbourne Borough-wide Supplementary Planning Document (adopted August 2004 (updated 2013)) which generally presumes against front dormers. The proposed development would also conflict with the House Extensions, Conversions and Driveways Supplementary Planning Guidance (adopted November 2020) which acknowledges that front dormers will not normally be acceptable due to their negative impact on the street scene.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

R Pankhurst

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and agree with the reasoning and recommendation. On that basis the appeal is dismissed.

L McKay

INSPECTOR